

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

REGINALD JONES,

Plaintiff,

v.

ANTHONY WILLS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 20-cv-1128-NJR

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

ROSENSTENGEL, Chief Judge:

This matter is before the Court on Reginald Jones's motions to compel related to the January 5, 2022 evidentiary hearing (Docs. 185, 186, and 187). Jones seeks an Order directing the witnesses to be provided with certain documents in preparation for the hearing and indicates his desire to appear at the hearing.

In both his first and third motions to compel (Docs. 185 and 187), Jones asks that defense counsel provide the witnesses with a number of documents prior to the evidentiary hearing. These documents include: Docs. 1 (including Exhibits I, J, and K), 130 (including the IGRV and cumulative counseling summaries for March 2016 and May 2020), 137 and exhibits, 142, 177, 184, Grievance #162-8-19 and grievance officer's reply, and the 5/11/2020 written statement to Krista Allsup. The Court **DIRECTS** defense counsel to provide the witnesses with the IGRV and the 2020 cumulative counseling summaries but notes again that Jones's 2016 grievances are not relevant to the claims in this case. Counsel should also make Jones's protective custody denial available to the

witnesses. All other documents, if not provided to the witnesses prior to the hearing, can be referenced at the hearing and presented digitally if needed. Thus, Jones's motions to compel (Docs. 185 and 187) are **GRANTED in part**.

In his second motion to compel (Doc. 186), Jones indicates his plans to attend the scheduled evidentiary hearing but notes that his cell door currently is not working. He also does not believe a work order has been put in to remedy the issue. He also indicates that he is worried that a tactical team will remove him from his cell or that he might be placed on crisis watch due to his recent refusal to speak with mental health staff. He fails to seek any relief from the Court, other than to make the Court aware of his intentions to proceed with the hearing and a request to reschedule the hearing should he be unable to attend through no fault of his own. Thus, his motion is **DENIED as moot**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**DATED: December 29, 2021**

---

**NANCY J. ROSENSTENGEL**  
**Chief U.S. District Judge**